

## United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/683,130	11/21/2001	Scott E. Trevino	GEMS8081.107	1211	
27061	7590 08/25/2005		EXAMINER		
ZIOLKOWSKI PATENT SOLUTIONS GROUP, SC (GEMS) 14135 NORTH CEDARBURG ROAD			LAVIN, CHRISTOPHER L		
MEQUON, V		,	· ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
•			2621		
			DATE MAILED: 08/25/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	09/683,130	TREVINO ET AL.			
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Christopher L. Lavin	2621			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe			lress		
THE REPLY FILED <u>08 August 2005</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A			7033		
1. ☑ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or o			pandonment of		
this application, applicant must timely file one of the follor places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No. (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in comp following time periods:	owing replies: (1) an amendment, a otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in liance with 37 CFR 1.114. The repl	ffidavit, or other evid compliance with 37 (	ence, which CFR 41.31; or		
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no					
event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o	f the final rejection.			
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b) MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f		RST REPLY WAS FILE	D WITHIN TWO		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened stabove, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three month earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL	which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a and the corresponding amount of the fee. atutory period for reply originally set in the	The appropriate extension of (2)	on fee under 37 as set forth in (b)		
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in com	pliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	e filed within two mor	iths of the date		
of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any e Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must l	extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)	), to avoid dismissal	of the appeal.		
AMENDMENTS  3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brie	of will not be entered	herause		
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further co	onsideration and/or search (see NC ow);	TE below);	•		
(c) ⊠ They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or			the issues for		
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a		ejected claims.			
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1			+ (DTOL 224)		
<ul> <li>4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.</li> <li>5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s</li> </ul>		omphant Amendmen	t (PTOL-324).		
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a		e, timely filed amendr	nent canceling		
the non-allowable claim(s).					
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		vill be entered and an	explanation of		
Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to:					
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE					
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, b because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).					
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessa	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under apperry and was not earlier presented.	eal and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)	ails to provide a (1).		
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	on of the status of the claims after	entry is below or atta	ched.		

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 4-05)

13. Other: \_\_\_\_.

See Continuation Sheet.

11. 

The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s).

## Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)

Application No.

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The incorporation of all of claim 12 and part of claim 10 into claim 9 creates a claim with a new scope. As claim 12 initially depended from claim 10, if all of claim 10 had also been moved into claim 9 then the scope would not have changed.

Continuation of 11. NOTE: The applicant's primary argument revolves around the word "may". The examiner has interpreted "may" as optional language. Thus "may" can be construed to read "may or may not". As shown in the previous office action the tertiary parameters cannot directly be changed and therefore changes to one parameter cannot affect another set of tertiary parameters. Finally it should be noted that steps define a method claim. The phrase starting at wherein and ending at the end of the claim is neither a step nor does it further describe a step. Therefore it may not even warrant any weight.

In order to correct the problems listed above the examiner suggests that the wherein statement be rewritten into a positively recited step where the requirement of the tertiary parameter change is made mandatory.

The remainder of the applicant's arguments over the 103 rejections have been fully considered and are not persusive. The examiner has provided a 103 rejection where the step lacking was pointed out, a secondary reference was provided to teach that step, and proper motivation was given.

BRIAN WERNER
PRIMARY EXAMINER